

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 5719 MP0115 Sehat Sutardja 09/966,914 09/27/2001 **EXAMINER** 23624 7590 04/14/2004 WILLIAMS, ALEXANDER O MARVELL SEMICONDUCTOR, INC. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT 700 FIRST AVENUE, MS# 509 2826 SUNNYVALE, CA 94089

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Ť
	09/966,914	SUTARDJA	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	Alexander O Williams	2826	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply pply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH- ute, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 10) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ Th 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters	•	
Disposition of Claims		•	
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,7,8,11-16,19,20,22-25 and 27-3 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,7,8,11-16,19,20,22-25 and 27-3 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.	tion.	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected to by the Examination is objected.	ccepted or b) objected to by e drawing(s) be held in abeyance ection is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Bure. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in App ority documents have been re au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/21/04.		mary (PTO-413) lail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2826

Serial Number: 09/966914 Attorney's Docket #: MP0115

Filing Date: 9/27/01;

Applicant: Sutardja

Examiner: Alexander Williams

Page 2

Applicant's Amendment, filed 1/16/04 is acknowledged.

Claims 5, 6, 9, 10, 17, 18, 21 and 26 have been canceled.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The divisional application information should be updated.

Appropriate correction is required.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 to 4, 7, 8, 11 to 16, 19, 20 and 22 to 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiraishi et al. (U.S. Patent # 6,525,414 B1) in view of Kato et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,424,573).

For example, in claim 1, similar claims 21, 29 (claim 1 and 12) and 30 which is similar to claim 29) and method of forming integrated chip package in claim 13, Shiraishi et al. (figure 4) show an integrated chip package, comprising: at least one semiconductor chip 101,103 each having a first surface and a second surface; an intermediate substrate 107 electrically coupled via conductive bumps 110 to the first surface of the at least one semiconductor chip; a planar package substrate 112 having a first surface electrically coupled to the intermediate substrate via a plurality of bonding wires 114, the intermediate substrate arranged above and spaced apart

Art Unit: 2826

(with 105 and the lower portion of 111 between 107 and 112) from the planar package substrate, but fail to explicitly show a heat sink having side portions extending towards the planar package surface, the heat sink thermally coupled to the second surfaces of the semiconductor chips so that heat generated from the at least one semiconductor chip flows toward the heat sink.

Initially, it is noted that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection based on (a frame 82 connected to a lid 83) and a heat sink; and intermediate substrate and board and semiconductor chip deals with an issue (i.e., the integration of multiple pieces into one piece or conversely, using multiple pieces in replacing a single piece) that has been previously decided by the courts.

In <u>Howard v. Detroit Stove Works</u> 150 U.S. 164 (1893), the Court held, "it involves no invention to cast in one piece an article which has formerly been cast in two pieces and put together...."

In <u>In re Larson</u> 144 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965), the term "integral" did not define over a multi-piece structure secured as a single unit. More importantly, the court went further and stated, "we are inclined to agree with the solicitor that the use of a one-piece construction instead of the [multi-piece] structure disclosed in Tuttle et al. would be merely a matter of obvious engineering choice" (bracketed material added). The court cited <u>In re Fridolph</u> for support.

In re Fridolph 135 USPQ 319 (CCPA 1962) deals with submitted affidavits relating to this issue. The underlying issue in In re Fridolph was related to the end result of making a multi-piece structure into a one-piece structure. Generally, favorable patentable weight was accorded if the one-piece structure yielded results not expected from the modification of the two-piece structure into a single piece structure.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the frame with the lid and the heat sink; and intermediate substrate and board and semiconductor chip as

Art Unit: 2826

"merely a matter of obvious engineering choice" as set forth in the above case law.

Kato et al. Is cited for showing a semiconductor package having optical interconnection access. Specifically, Kato et al. (figure 2) discloses at least two semiconductor chips 10 each having a first surface and a second surface and a heat sink 82,83 having side portions extending towards the planar package 80 surface, the heat sink thermally coupled to the second surfaces of the semiconductor chips so that heat generated from the at least two semiconductor chip flows toward the heat sink (see column 7, lines 47-58) for the purpose of providing means which achieves practical application of optical interconnection technology to high speed and/or high density semiconductor package the bottleneck with regard to input/output pins in high speed and/or high density semiconductor packages.

In claims 2, 14 and similar claim 23, the combination with Kato et al.'s second surface of the at least one semiconductor chip 10 is adhesively bonded to the heat sink 82,83.

In claims 3, 15 and similar claim 24, the combination with Kato et al.'s heat sink 82,83 is substantially thermally isolated from the planar package substrate 80.

In claims 4, 16, and similar claim 25, the combination with Shiraishi et al.'s intermediate substrate 107,105 formed from a material selected from silicon 105.

In claim 7, the combination with Shiraishi et al.'s conductive bumps 110 formed form Au.

In claim 8 and 19, the combination with Shiraishi et al.'s intermediate substrate 107 includes a circuit plane 108 selected from interconnect planes.

In claims 11, 20 and similar claim 28, the combination show either reference with planar package substrate including conductive pads on a second surface (bottom of 112).

In claim 12, the combination with Shiraishi et al. further comprising a support material (with 105 and the lower portion of 111 between 107 and 112) arranged between the planar package 112 and the intermediate substrate 107.

In claim 27, the combination with Shiraishi et al.'s flip chip conversion means 107 including a means for electrically interconnecting (by 109).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Kato et al.'s two semiconductor chips to modify Shiraishi et al.'s package of one semiconductor chip for the purpose of providing means which achieves practical application of optical interconnection

Art Unit: 2826

technology to high speed and/or high density semiconductor package the bottleneck with regard to input/output pins in high speed and/or high density semiconductor packages.

Response

Applicant's arguments filed 1/16/04 have been fully considered, but are most in view of the new grounds of rejections detailed above.

The listed references are cited as of interest to this application, but not applied at this time.

Field of Search	Date
U.S. Class and subclass: 257/686,685,723,777,778,737,738,734,712,704,710,717, 720,532,724,728,725,528	3/17/03 11/3/03 4/12/04
Other Documentation: foreign patents and literature in 257/686,685,723,777,778,737,738,734,712,704,710,717, 720,532,724,728,725,528	3/17/03 11/2/03 4/12/04
Electronic data base(s): U.S. Patents EAST	3/17/03 11/2/03 4/12/04

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander O Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272 1924. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-7:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272 1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2826

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 6

AOW 4/12/04

> Alexander Williams Primary Examiner